



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

KULTUR, AUSBREITUNG UND HERKUNFT DER INDO-GERMANEN von Sigmund Feist. Mit 36 Textabbildungen und 5 Tafeln. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. M. 13 (unbound).

Feist's book is scarcely to be described as a new attempt to determine the location and characteristics of the people who spoke primitive Indo-European; it seeks rather to give a popular summary of the various facts relating to this question and gives comparatively little space to theorizing from these facts. In such theorizing as he allows himself Feist places the Primitive Indo-European community in Central Asia, leaving the reader free choice of a more exact location within this vast territory (pp. 518 ff., especially 527). As to the physical and cultural description he is even less dogmatic; again and again he foregoes the choice between a number of possibilities; thus, about the family (p. 115), the dwelling (p. 139), flora (p. 196), metals (p. 198), weapons (pp. 216, 219), and so on. Those who are acquainted with the cock-sure statements which most writers on this subject affect, often only to withdraw them a few years later in favor of contrary but equally confident and equally unproved assertions, will thank Feist for this attitude. Indeed, he who looks for scientific certainty will wish that the author had come even nearer to accepting Wundt's dictum (*Völkerpsychologie*, I, 2, p. 612, quoted by Feist, p. V. f.): "Alle Annahmen über die primitive Kultur der Indogermanen sind ins Gebiet der wissenschaftlichen Mythenbildung zu verweisen, und nicht viel anders wird man über die mannigfachen Versuche denken können, die Urheimat dieser Völkerfamilie auszufinden."¹

The case is perhaps not quite so desperate, but, whatever the future may bring, this sentence does fairly well describe the present state of the problem. By the name "Primitive Indo-European" we designate the uniform language or dialect which must have been spoken at the moment before the setting in of the first of those dialectal differentiations which have resulted in the multiplicity of languages of our family. Our reconstructions of forms of this language are, to some extent, only symbolic; whatever their significance, though, so much is certain: they apply only to the last moment of uniformity before the first dialect-cleavage that has left any record. After that point in time we can no longer speak of Primitive Indo-European, but must speak of pre-Greek, pre-Germanic, and so on; even such groupings as pre-Balto-Slavic (instead of

¹ In his third edition (p. 658 ff.) Wundt expresses himself more mildly but no less decisively.

pre-Baltic and pre-Slavic) or pre-Italo-Celtic (instead of pre-Italic and pre-Celtic) have been seriously questioned. The grouping into a *centum*-dialect and a *satem*-dialect also has been severely attacked and is probably unfounded,—as Feist, I am glad to see, agrees (p. 445 ff.).

Now, in the days before writing, rapid travel, and all the rest, a language as uniform as that postulated by our reconstructions could have been spoken only in a very small community,—at most by a few thousand souls. And although the oldest actual records of Indo-European language may not go safely back of the year 1000 B. C., yet it is impossible to say how ancient the time may be when the uniform Primitive Indo-European language was spoken; the earliest differentiation which is to be compensated in our reconstructions may lie millenia upon millenia back of the Indo-European names in the records of Boghazköi and Tel-el-Amarna. In short, the people who spoke that speech which we call by the ponderous name of Primitive Indo-European was a small community, indefinitely far back in pre-history. It existed without those improvements in civilization which bring about the wider numeric expansion of speech-communities. Its speech may have been related to that of other similar communities whose dialects have since died out or been changed beyond recognition. At any rate, it was one tribe among many others, struggling and also wandering over the earth, much like the tribes of North America,—one tribe, whose speech has since displaced that of hundreds or even thousands of others. All this, be it noted, follows directly from the linguistic data,—that is, from the postulated uniformity of speech, to which we must adhere, no matter how far back in time we must go to find it.

Feist, by the way, like most writers on his subject, sometimes ignores this postulate,—upon which, of course, the whole discussion is primarily based and by which alone it is made possible. He likes to speak of a larger community divided into groups so as to admit of several possibilities of civilization (cf. especially, e. g. pp. 97, 115, 211).

The task, then, of him who would tell us of the "Culture, Spread, and Derivation of the Indo-Europeans" is only to outline the facts which come into question as possibly relating to these things; more one cannot do. These facts fall under the heads of linguistics, pre-history, ethnology, and anthropology. The linguistic facts are definite, but, as we do not know where, when, and by whom the language in question was spoken, the other three subjects can be dealt with only by acquainting the reader with the vast range of possibilities,—one might almost say, by giving an outline of these three sciences. Feist

has at his command considerable bibliography and is well learned, but his arrangement of the discussion is not good; it is highly uneven and often confusing. Thus part of the discussion of somatic types inserts itself suddenly (p. 83) into that of ceramics; the transition to matters anthropologic could have been made at a dozen points and should have been placed more carefully. The anthropologic part of the book is generally weak; Boas' work on change of somatic features with change of environment is not mentioned. Ethnology also is slighted; a perfunctory reference to Wundt's *Elemente der Völkerpsychologie* (p. 24, in lieu of a treatment of totemism and related phenomena) is seen to deserve this adjective when the totally inadequate description of early beliefs and world-view contains such a statement as this (p. 333): "Der Geist oder Gott wird in bestimmten Bäumen lokalisiert, dort verehrt und schliesslich mit dem Baume identifiziert." Pre-history fares best of all and is well illustrated, but even here the discussion lacks coherence. Feist deserves credit, however, for not in this connection overestimating etymologic data.

The linguistic part also is inadequate. On pages 42 ff. Feist makes the old, hopeless attempt to give the facts of Indo-European comparative linguistics in a nutshell, a thing which can't be done and would interest no one if it could. As is usual in such cases, phonology, which alone lends itself to summaries, disproportionately outweighs morphology and syntax,—which, by the way, receive no interpretation throughout the whole book, although they tell us more about the Primitive Indo-European people than all other sources together. And, as is also not uncommon, brevity here means inaccuracy. Thus, p. 49, we hear that the P. IE. labiovelars appear in Celtic throughout as labials, and on p. 51 we are told that French and Swedish have no fixed word-accent, that musical word-accent like that of Swedish exists in German Rhenish dialects ("oder in der Kindersprache", adds Feist), and on the same page the "free" word-accent ("free" here needs definition, of course, for the layman) of Russian, Servian, Lithuanian, and Modern Greek is cited as if to prove that the word-accent of P. IE. was musical; though these are the only mis-statements, this confused paragraph would mislead the lay reader on other points as well, if he read it. On p. 313 we are suddenly given two Lithuanian strophes in the original "um den Wohlklang dieser altertümlichen idg. Sprache zu zeigen",—although not the slightest indication of pronunciation is given, even the accent-marks being left off. Of other languages Basque for some reason receives on pages 360 ff. a description of almost Saycean quality, but that is not altogether Feist's

fault. As a linguist Feist ought to use the term "Semitic" as a linguistic concept, but he is not doing this when he calls the Masai Semitic; they have been called so because some of their legends sound like Old Testament stories.

The most interesting parts of the book are—the passages which deal with the more newly found Asiatic IE. languages, and those (32 f., 480 ff., 510 ff.,—especially 483) in which Feist presents his own theory (cf., PBB. 36, 350 f.), according to which Germanic is simply Celtic speech in the mouths of a population that previously spoke a non-Indo-European language; the Germanic sound-shift and other features of Germanic sound-history are the alterations which Celtic suffered in the mouths of this population, and about one-third of the Germanic vocabulary is retained from the earlier non-Indo-European language.² Needless to say that this theory in its specific form has little to support it, and in general it is likely that Germanic represents a decidedly normal development from P. IE. and Celtic rather than that of an IE. language imposed on a people of other tongue.—For the most part, however, the book is not interestingly written; Feist's style is not brilliant and his presentation is inconvenient. In spite of the praiseworthy abstention from dogmatism Feist's book will not take a place beside Schrader's foundation-work and Hirt's fascinating exposition. Publisher and printer deserve high credit for the appearance of the volume.

LEONARD BLOOMFIELD.

University of Illinois.

² This whole theory has been abandoned by Feist in his recent pamphlet *Indogermanen und Germanen* (Halle, 1914), in which he discusses most ably and, for the most part, convincingly, a number of problems which he could only touch upon in the larger work, owing to the limited space allowed to him by the publishers.—[Editor.]

AARON HILL. POET, DRAMATIST, PROJECTOR. By Dorothy Brewster, Ph.D. New York. Columbia University Press. 1913.

This recent volume of the Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature brings to light a mislaid author. With the single exception of Southey, Aaron Hill affords the most monumental example of a vanished reputation. His name stood in the headlines of his own age, but in the footnotes of posterity. Like the author of "Wat Tyler," Hill was undoubtedly the most moral man of letters of his time, for Richardson's long-skirted morality occasionally tripped the wearer. For founding a colony in America, Hill entertained an abortive scheme, which differed from Pantisocracy only in being more practical, and like Southey, too, he